



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,175	12/03/2001	Hitoshi Fukushima	9319S-000311	6906

27572 7590 07/30/2003

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

GHYKA, ALEXANDER G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2812

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,175

Applicant(s)

FUKUSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander G. Ghya

Art Unit

2812

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2812

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Restriction Requirement***

1. Applicant's election of Group I, Claims 1-26 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that both groups of claims are drawn to subject matter which are so related to each other that an undue burden would not be placed upon the Examiner. This is not found persuasive because the groups are classified in different classes and a complete search would place an undue burden.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Therefore, Claims 1-26 are now under consideration.

### ***Specification***

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the Abstract should contain one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: numerous typographical and grammatical errors. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 9-26 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75© as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 9-26 not been further treated on the merits.

Art Unit: 2812

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**8. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enick et al (US 6,183,815).**

9. Enick et al disclose a method and composition for the surface treatment of metals which includes a method of self assembling a mono layer by using a thiol as claimed in Claim 7 and compressed carbon dioxide as a solvent. See column 2, lines 15-30 , column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 10, and column 3, line 60 to line 67. Moreover, Enick et al disclose the use of propanol as a solvent. See column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 15.

Art Unit: 2812

10. Thus, Enick et al is shown to teach all of the features of the claims with the exception of requiring the presence of compressed liquid carbon dioxide.

11. One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would have found it obvious to arrive at the presently claimed limitations, as the use of an optional solvent, compressed carbon dioxide, for its known purpose would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. The use of compressed carbon dioxide for its benefit as a solvent is *prima facie* obvious in view of the disclosure of Enick et al. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established.

### ***Double Patenting***

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 2812

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of copending Application No. 10/006,794. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications require the same solvents to be used in making a self assembled mono layer.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### *Conclusion*

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alex Ghyka whose telephone number is (703) 305-3407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John F. Niebling, can be reached on (703) 308-3325. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Art Unit: 2812

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

AGG

July 22, 2003

ALEXANDER GHYKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Av 2812  
*Alex Ghyska*